

[22nd October 1927]

## Local Boards

### *Qualification of clerks under local bodies.*

\* 852 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether any qualification is insisted upon for being eligible for service as clerks under the local bodies; and

(b) if so, what it is?

A.—(a) & (b) The following qualifications have been prescribed for head clerks and head accountants of local board offices and municipal offices:—

#### Local board offices.

(1) A complete Secondary School-Leaving Certificate or the Matriculation Examination of the Madras University or a corresponding examination of any University; and

(2) Account test.

None are prescribed for other clerks.

#### Municipal offices.

(1) A complete Secondary School-Leaving Certificate the holder of which is declared to be eligible for the University course or the Matriculation Examination of the Madras University or a corresponding examination of any other University; and

(2) Account test.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"With reference to the last sentence of the answer, may I know whether the hon. Minister is prepared to consider the question of prescribing some test, some qualification for all the clerks concerned?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I shall have that matter looked into."

### *Alleged harsh treatment of certain mistresses in Ponnani Taluk Board schools.*

\* 853 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: With reference to my question No. 203 answered on 26th August 1927 on the subject of the alleged harsh treatment of certain mistresses in Ponnani Taluk Board schools, will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state what action Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—No action has been or is proposed to be taken in the matter.

### *Proposed road along the middle of the Netravati railway bridge.*

\* 854 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: With reference to Mr. J. A. Saldanha's question No. 307 answered on 27th August 1927, will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the South Kanara District Advancement Association has in its letter, dated 9th August 1927, addressed to the Secretary to Government, Local Self-Government Department, suggested that the proposed road might be laid along the middle of the Netravati railway bridge and kept open for public traffic during only such hours as will not interrupt the train services;

22nd October 1927]

(b) whether the Agent, South Indian Railway Company, has considered the above proposal and thinks it feasible; and

(c) if so, what action will be taken in the matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Agent has reported that the proposal is not feasible.

(c) The Government have decided to drop the matter.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I ask why the Government have chosen to drop this matter and also whether the railway companies objected to it because it would affect their traffic? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" No, Sir. The objection to it was that any additional weight to this bridge would endanger its structure."

*Additional nominations to the District Board of Kistna.*

\* 855 Q.—The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) why the Government nominated 18 more members to the District Board of Kistna by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 13th September 1927, five months after the reconstitution of the Board;

(b) whether all of them were elected members of the previous District Board; if not, how many;

(c) whether the President, District Board, Kistna, was consulted about these nominations;

(d) whether it is a fact that M.R.Ry. Kandimalla Sitarama Rao Bahadur Garu and M.R.Ry. Gummadapu Venkataranga Rao Garu were the ex-officio members of the old Kistna District Board and that they were nominated as members of their respective taluk boards to facilitate their becoming ex-officio members of the reconstituted District Board;

(e) whether it is a fact that the abovesaid two gentlemen have tried for the presidentship of the respective taluk boards and failed, and thus they have lost their ex-officio membership;

(f) whether the Government have considered the question of nominating the elected members of the old District Board to the reconstituted District Board when they first constituted it; if so, why the Government have taken up the question again; and

(g) whether there is any precedent for this policy of adding nominations to the local boards from time to time?

A.—(a) The Government considered the appointments desirable.

(b) Fourteen of the new members were elected members of the old Kistna District Board.

(c) No.

(d) The gentlemen referred to were ex-officio members of the old Kistna District Board. They were appointed to their respective taluk boards, but not for the reasons suggested.

(e) The Government have no information.

(f) Yes. The reason is as stated in clause (a) supra.

(g) No. There has been no previous case of reconstitution of district boards under section 240 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920.